

Smith (J. D.)

A FEW FACTS

IN RELATION TO THE

LOBELIA AND PEPPER PRACTICE:

ITS PROSPECTS AND POLICY;

AS CHALLENGED BY

"PROFESSOR" M. S. THOMSON,

IN HIS RECENT PAMPHLET.

BY J. DICKSON SMITH, M. D.,
MACON, GEORGIA.

TELEGRAPH STEAM PRINTING HOUSE.

1859.

Alph
Brof

Surgeon General's Office
LIBRARY
30144
Washington

A FEW FACTS, &c

The Lobelia Practice—inaugurated by Samuel Thomson, and founded, as it was, in abject ignorance—had nothing to recommend it to the good sense and favor of the people, save the noisy clamorings of its self-constituted and self-inflated founder; and whether from force of habit, or from the same motive of necessity, the very same policy is still pursued, even down to the closing paragraph of a recent 80 page pamphlet, issued in the city of Macon. So notorious, indeed, is the habit with Thomsonians, of boasting, gassing, and abusing other people, that almost every page of their books and journals are full of it, and every lecture and discourse deeply imbued with the same spirit. And yet, so exquisitely sensitive are they, that the slightest allusion to that practice is, at once, repelled with bitterness and scorn. Have not many of the quiet and unobtrusive medical practitioners of our own city, been thus wantonly assailed, without provocation?—That this is true, let the files of the Macon papers attest; and that I have been similarly attacked, no candid reader of recent pamphlets will question.

In an article contributed to the Savannah Medical Journal, I alluded, passingly, to the Lobelia Practice, but with no disposition to attack that system, or call in question the truth or absurdity of its doctrines; and notwithstanding the remark was accompanied with complimentary credit to modern Thomsonians for having abandoned such “heroic routine,” yet I was forthwith assailed, through the city papers, by M. S. THOMSON, M. D., PROF. OF OBSTETRICS, DISEASES OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN, THERAPEUTICS, AND MATERIA MEDICA, IN THE REFORM MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA !” With avidity he assumed championship, and seized upon this as a fresh pretext for an attack *personal* upon myself, and a general onslaught upon the Medical Faculty! Before me lies his *Fourth* article, all pointing the same direction; the last of which beats the foremost of all who have practiced the strain of bragadocia and abuse, leaving them all *far back* in the shade! Indeed, the “*Professor*” indulges more *personal slang* and *invective insinuation*, and pours forth a larger volume of gas, smoke, *et id omne genus*, than I had supposed him capable of generating!!

Now, in all this, I see but one object. It was evidently designed, *ad captandum vulgus*, for himself, *individually*, or his moribund Pepper practice. Consequently I have no disposition to denur. As it is the adopted policy—the last hope, and only alternative for reviving the flickerings of Thomsonism, and upholding the Pepper practice before the people, we will cheerfully allow them the benefit of these expedients.

From the nauseating task of reviewing this 80 page pamphlet, I forbear. Have not our citizens already been sickened with Lobotomy, and sufficiently *bored* with such nauseating harangues?—To repeat, then, all those reckless assertions, vain-glorious brags, and boastful money challenges with which this pamphlet abounds, would be but to disgust, to the extreme, the modest reader? Adhering, then, to my published determination, to pursue the “controversy” no farther, I pass with *contempt* all such stuff, intending only to examine one or two of the “Professor’s” illustrations, and to survey some of the new fields that he has opened up.—This I propose to do, because the public is justly entitled to these challenged facts, and ought to know what “gross frauds” are being perpetrated in their midst.

With an exultant air, our “*Professor*” points to Prof. Bennett, of Edinburgh, as illustrating the fact that the whole medical world is coming over to Thomsonism, and advises me to read Bennett’s late book, as embodying the most recent expressions of medical science: That Prof. Bennett, the “highest medical authority,” hailing from the “highest seat of medical learning,” has sounded a new “key-note” and that the whole medical choir is striking up the same tune.

Now, this announcement is anything in the world *but correct*. I know what Bennett says, for I have his book, and had read it before I ever saw “*Prof.*” M. S. Thomson to know him. And I further know that the medical faculty, *even in Edinburgh*, have *not* adopted his new theory—for the Appendix of Bennett’s own book shows the fact!

Whatever Prof. Bennett’s views, then, as detailed in a series of quotations from his book, by our learned “*Prof.*” suffice it to say that he stands almost a *unit* in his new doctrine of theory and practice. He has conceived a new dogma, and seeks just such statistical reports as may tend to sustain it; but the very same Pa-

thological facts, revealed to him by microscopic research, and upon which he founds his recent opinions, are equally familiar to all expert microscopists, but with different convictions as to the establishment of new Pathological and Therapeutic laws.

To show the non-reception of Prof. Bennett's doctrine, I would point "*Prof.*" Thomson to the Appendix of Bennett's book, where, with the aid of his "plain glasses" he may discover that the medical faculty of Great Britain, are down upon Bennett with the *severest criticisms*—denouncing his views as *untenable*, and *not* supported by clinical facts; and that Bennett there defends himself against such men as Allison, Watson, Bell, Christison, Easton, *et al*; while, *only one man*, Dr. Markham, is mentioned as publicly upholding his new doctrines. Bennett intimates that many agree with him "essentially," but gives the name of *only one* who fully adopts his views.

Yet, such is the showing of Prof. Bennett, as to the reception of his recent theory and practice in medicine; and such are the facts from which "*Prof.*" Thomson, would have his readers believe that the medical world is undergoing revolution, and Thomsonism being universally adopted! *Reader, it is all a hoax!* one of our "Professors" *ad captandum* tricks! Bennett is *not* the text book of modern medicine, nor at all likely *ever* to be; and "*Prof.*" Thomson has greatly deceived his readers, in making such a *false* impression upon them.

The reviewers of Bennett's book have so thoroughly canvassed the whole subject of his new practice, as in their summary report, to completely disrobe Prof. Bennett of his claimed unprecedented success in treating Inflammations. The aggregate statistical report of all the hospitals of Europe and Great Britain, favors *decidedly*, a discriminating use of the lancet, and antiphlogistic treatment, (see Braithwaite's Retrospect, Jan. 1859, page 69.)

Bennett's reviewers, both British and American, likewise show that, the late comparative abandonment of the lancet in *pneumonia* and other phlegmasiæ, is attributable, *not* to any change in Therapeutics, but to the very fact—contended for in my recent papers—of the marked change in the "character and type" of modern disease, and they quote the very language of Dr. Watson, in justification of this opinion. "There are," says Watson, "waves of time through which the *sthenic* and *asthenic* characters of disease prevail in succession, and that we are, at present, living

amid one of its adynamic phases." (*See N. American Medico Chirurg. Review*, 1858, page 618; and *British and Foreign Med. Chirurg. Review*, July 1858, page 1.)

This report corroborates exactly what I said, in relation to the prevalent diseases of Middle Georgia, that "there is an evident tendency in diseases of late years, to assume a low, typhoid character—a tendency to prostration of the powers of life," and that "this feature of modern disease enjoins the necessity of husbanding the strength of the patient, frequently, from the very commencement." Now I am happy to find that this position is so *fully sustained* by the ablest American and British authorities.

We have thus seen that Prof. Bennett's theoretical views, which our "Professor" claims as Thomsonian, have neither been adopted by the Profession, nor sustained by clinical facts. They have been promulgated by him, and everybody concedes to him the right of entertaining his own opinions, reserving similar rights to themselves. But *practically*—in regard to the employment of remedial agents, Bennett is no more a Thomsonian, than is a chimney-sweep a wood sawyer—judging them by their implements. Bennett employs the standard *Materia Medica*, and *not one* of the boasted Thomsonian medicines do I find in all his clinic recipes. Our "Professor," consequently, need not be alarmed!—Bennett has *not* "stolen" any of his *remedial agents*, notwithstanding his serious apprehensions that "Edinburgh College" may "STEAL" his "THUNDER."

So much, then, for the *hoax* practiced upon his readers by "Prof." M. S. Thomson, of Macon, in gulling them with the delusion that Prof. Bennett, of the University of Edinburgh, has turned *steamer*, and is now leading the medical world with his enchanting whistle! It would be just as truthful to say that, to-day, everybody in Macon—men, women and children, are following, with wild enchantment, the jargon notes of that CALIOPE now passing our streets. There would be as much truth in the one proposition, as there is in the other.

"HOW LITTLE APPLES DO SWIM, I DECLARE"!!!

Consonant with that same extravagant and reckless tone that pervades his entire pamphlet, the "Professor" speaks boastingly of his "*Thomsonian Colleges throughout the country*;" and in doing which he *pointedly contradicts* what he said, only last year, in his Reform Journal, about the *shipwrecked* condition of *all* the

Thomsonian Colleges, except his own at Macon. "Prof." Thomson could not have forgotten the *direct* and *positive* statements of an article that was published in his own Macon College Journal—no longer than September 1858, and written by himself or some one of his own Faculty.

This article distinctly declares that, "*To-day the College at Macon is the only Reform Medical School in the world, now above wind and tide.*" "Professor" Thomson! recur to your own Pepper Journal, page 270, and read what you said about the "*effects of the true light of Medical Reform*" having been "*scattered.*"—Tell me whether you meant what you said, and if so, how is the public to reconcile that statement with what you now say about "*Thomsonian Colleges throughout the country*"? A man who "*has not departed from the truth in 20 years*" can certainly make his own statements harmonize.

In order to show that there were no Thomsonian Colleges in 1858, let us review this article, published in the Macon Journal. This article, together with the 'Reform Medical Practice' published by the Faculty of the Macon College, gives account of but Five Colleges of this order in the United States. The Worcester College, in Mass., departed from the faith and died many years ago. "It sickened (of Lobelia,) pined and passed away among the things that were, but are not."—(Macon Journal, Sept. 1858, page 270.)

The Metropolitan College of the city of New York "sprang into existence at the instance of the Reform Medical Convention of the U. S." and was designed as a National School. But what was the result of *this* effort? Why, it never grew beyond the dimension of a "12 by 12 garrett room," with a class of "15 or 20 students." Even Profs. Loomis and Comings, with the renowned "Ajax," Prof. Curtis, "*could not make it go!*" "It lived for a while in a sickly condition, and finally dwindled into the embrace of *Eclecticism*, where it now stands, *like the 'Niobe of Nations' voiceless and childless.*"—(Macon Journal.)

"Prof." Thomson says of the recent announcement of this College, that "we look in vain for any well defined principle of Medical Reform." (See Macon Journal, Oct. 1858, page 314.)

Such has been the fate, and such the present condition of the great Metropolitan College of N. Y! *Literally dead*, as a Thomsonian school, and *why*? "The Northern mind," says "Prof."

M. S. Thomson, "has failed to realize the majesty of the simple truths of Thomsonism;" and he further says, that it is "lamentably too true" that "Thomsonism North has had its day, and what is left of it is so mixed up with *other isms*, as hardly to be distinguishable in the mass." (See Macon Journal, Sept. '58, p. 280.)

Next on the list is the Botanico-Medical College at Cincinnati—the first Thomsonian School ever established! Where does it stand to-day? "Among the things that *were* but *are not*;" "stranded upon the shoals of *Eclecticism*." Its charter was surrendered years ago, and a Physio-Medical College organized in its place, whose faculty is *strictly* Eclectic. Prof. Curtis has been the only man in that School for many years past, who "battled" in the cause of true Thomsonism, but the "*old man eloquent*" has fallen, overwhelmed by the surging tide of dissensions from within, and opposing elements from without. "He has been compelled to retire to the common drudgery of the school room." The requiem of Reform Medicine in that School has been sung! and *why*? There is "no congenial *soil* for its advancement." "Medical Reform in the Northwest has reached its culminating point, and is rapidly waning into insignificance, and stranding upon the shoals of Eclecticism." (See Macon Journal, Sept., 1858, page 274.)

The Botanico-Medical College of Memphis, has been "driven to the wall" for want of encouragement and patronage and so far has it apostatized in faith, and gone from the doctrines of Thomsonism, that it is now "controlled," says the Macon Faculty, "by inexperienced teachers, unknown to the Profession of Reform Medicine in the South." (See Macon Journal, Sept., 1858, page 274.)

We have now reviewed the history, and marked the downfall or apostacy of *four* of the *only five* Thomsonian Colleges in existence. This is the pitiful account given of them in "Professor" M. S. Thomson's own Botanic Journal: some having "departed from the faith;" others, under new names, have adopted more wholesome creeds; others "gone to the wall" for want of encouragement and patronage, and *ALL* *defunct* as Thomsonian Schools. This report is likewise substantiated by other evidence. The Reform Medical Association, which met at Montgomery in April, 1859, recognized but "*two Reform Medical Colleges*," one at Memphis, and the Macon College. (See Macon Journal, June, 1859.)

Now, to show that the College at Memphis is not Thomsonian,

I refer the reader to its organ—the “Memphis Medical Review”—which the editor says is devoted to the “*investigation of Medical science, and a Review of the opinions and practices of Medical men of all Schools.*”

So I am now prepared to proclaim to the citizens of Macon that, their City is the honored locality of the *only* Thomsonian College in the world! In the language of its own faculty, I repeat that “to-day it is the only Reform Medical School in the world, now above wind and tide, which bids defiance to the storms that may howl around its base.”

What then goes with that vain-glorious statement of “Prof.” M. S. Thomson about Thomsonian “*Colleges throughout the country?*” Was it not thrown in for *Buncombe*? Where are they? Where are we to find them? If we look North, Northwest, East or Northeast, we find but a mutilated wreck of Thomsonism. When we turn our eyes West and Southwestward, even to the “favorable locality” of Memphis, with all “the advantages of its central position,” we find but a “*sickly*” School, with a faculty “unknown to the Profession of Thomsonism!” MACON, then, is the *only* point where the Lobelia system finds a “*congenial soil.*”

Now, reader, is not this report humiliating to those who are enthusiastic in this cause? Is it not discouraging to those whose predilections incline them to enlist under the banner of Thomsonism? If after an experiment of more than half a century, the field over which this banner has waived, presents but a mutilated wreck; if along the coast, nothing is to be seen but tattered mast-heads, and other evidences of “stranding” from the storm of “inappreciation,” and disgust; what is there in all the future to cheer and animate the votaries of Thomsonism? What hope of success in the future, when the memory of the past unfolds such humiliating evidences of *signal failure*? Sixty years! grappling for popular favor; and yet Thomsonism boasts of but *one* School in which are taught the wonderful (?) doctrines of “Medical Reform!”

“HOW LITTLE APPLES DO SWIM, I DECLARE”!!!

I have been taken to task, and severely upbraided by “Prof.” Thomson, for presuming to show up Thomsonian Medicine, from the *original* Thomsonian book. He complains in these words?—“This system that has now its colleges (?) throughout the country

and its principles elaborately set forth in large volumes of more than a Thousand pages, is still represented by Dr. Smith, as depending on that little book of very antiquated date, for direction and guidance."

Now! to the charge of unfairness in this act, I demur, on the ground that the origin of a system may very properly be shown up from *the book* that first promulgated its doctrines to the world. If compelled, under penalty, to produce a *correct* exposition of 'simon pure' Thomsonism I should certainly take it from the pages of this original volume of Samuel Thomson—and from the *glaring* fact that, modern Thomsonian books are so extravagantly and *outrageously* adulterated with Allopathic composition! So true is this that I know of *no other* book that is *reliably* Thomsonianism.

I suppose that "Prof." Thomson, in the mention of "large volumes of over a Thousand pages," alludes to his own book—the "Reform Medical Practice," published by the faculty of the Reform Medical College of Macon, in 1857? This is, indeed, a large volume, and contains more *good reading* than any Thomsonian(?) book *extant*. I speak knowingly of its contents, for I read a great part of it *twelve years ago*—just about ten years before the "large volume" was published! Strange as this may seem, it is nevertheless *true*.

But reader! this fact is not inexplicable to those who read the standard Medical authors of the day, for they have the key to the whole *enigma*. The fact is, this big book has been '*picked up*'—a large part of it copied *verbatim*, from our best authors, and yet it claims to be an "*elaborate*" *expose* of Thomsonism? I mention this fact merely as one of the amusing developments of the age of "Reform!" When a man speaks *boastingly* of *his own* (?) book, then we have a right to examine that book; and the public has an indisputable right to know what it is.

I mean to say, then, that the authors of the "Reform Medical Practice" published at Macon, are chargeable with plagiarism—*extensive* and *undeniable plagiarism*; that they have purloined from the pages of Watson, Wood, Dunglison *et alias*, without extending the common courtesy of mentioning their names, or even acknowledging the composition by quotation marks. The very language of these authors is copied—*word for word*—and incorporated in the body of this book as its own composition. From a

single paragraph to *twenty pages consecutively* have thus been copied *verbatim et literatim*.

That the reader may have some idea as to the extent of this copying process, I invite his attention to the following table of references, in which the corresponding pages of the several books,—copied from—are noted, that he may turn to them and read for himself. The books referred to are Watson's Practice of Physic, ed. 1845; Wood's Practice of Medicine, 1855; Dunglison's Practice, 1848; and Stokes & Bell, 1848.

Table of reference, showing the different authors and the pages copied from, into the Reform Medical Practice—published by the Faculty of the Reform College at Macon.

NAME OF DISEASE.	REFORM MED. PRACTICE.	AUTHOR COPIED.	PAGE.
Purulent Ophthalmia.....	390	Watson.....	188
Gonorrheal do	293	"	195
Strumous do	297	"	202
Iritis.....	301	"	207
Rheumatic Ophthalmia.....	306	"	215
Ramollissement.....	327	"	262
Hypertrophy of Brain.....	312	"	266
Atrophy of Brain.....	334	"	268
Delirium Tremens.....	347	"	252
Epilepsy.....	407	"	387
Paralysis Agitans.....	428	"	420
Hysteria.....	434	"	423
Catalepsy.....	443	"	433
Ecstasy.....	446	"	435
Neuralgia.....	449	"	436
Epistaxis.....	459	"	379
Bronchocele.....	462	"	481
Cretinism.....	465	"	486
Aphthæ.....	474	"	494
Quinsy.....	476	"	497
Laryngitis.....	481	"	504
Do.	484	"	504
Diseases of Thorax.....	500	"	529
Do. Do.	502	"	531
Catarrh.....	514	"	540
Pertussis.....	536	"	565
Heamoptysis'.....	570	Dunglison, Vov. 1	306
Visicular Emphysema.....	575	" "	349
Hypertrophy of Heart.....	611	" "	529
Angina Pectoris.....	619	" "	553

Pericarditis.....	625	Watson	695
Thoracic Aneurisms.....	633	"	713
Phlebitis.....	640	"	721
Asthma.....	649	"	729
Peritonitis.....	658	Dunglison Vol. 1	199
Gastritis.....	667	Watson.....	769
Cancer of Stomach.....	674	"	780
Hematemesis.....	676	"	781
Enteritis.....	697	Dunglison, Vol. 1	96
Enteralgia.....	701	"	161
Painters Colic.....	710	"	164
Diarrhea.....	720	"	117
Cholera Morbus.....	727	"	128
Do. ".....	729	Watson.....	821
Cholera Infantum.....	740	Dunglison Vol. 1	147
Dysentery.....	744	"	110
Do.	746	Watson.....	829-30
Worms.....	755	"	840
Icterus.....	786	Dunglison, Vol. 1	666
Nephritis.....	795	Bell & Stokes vol. 1	561
Ischuria Renalis.....	813	"	584
Albuminuria.....	829	Dunglison, Vol. 1	689
Do.	833	"	698
Do.	832	Watson	897
Hematuria.....	835	Bell & Stokes, Vol. 1	608
Gout.....	855	Watson.....	931
Intermittent Fever.....	863	Wood.....	1 241 20pp.
Do.	866	Eberle Vol. 1	112
Remittent Fever.....	888	Wood, Vol. 1	264 16pp.
Do. ".....	901	"	1 287
Typhoid Fever.....	904	"	1 325 20pp.
Typhus Fever.....	929	"	1 351 12pp.
Congestive Fever.....	946	"	1 293 11pp.
Yellow Fever.....	960	"	1 306 14pp.
Varicella.....	992	"	1 405
Rhubeola.....	995	"	1 406 6½pp.
Scarlatina.....	1005	"	1 414 10pp.
Urticaria.....	1019	"	2 391 4pp.
Tobes Mesenterica.....	1026	Dunglison, Vol. 2	95
Rachitis.....	1039	"	" 2 674
Hypochondriasis.....	1053	"	" 2 280
Otitis.....	1060	"	" 2 333
Amaurosis.....	311	Watson.....	222
Spinal Irritation.....	351	"	294

TREATMENT COPIED.

Remittent Fever.....	900	Wood, Vol. 1	285
"	900	"	1 287



"	"	903	"	"	1	292
Typhoid	"	922	"	"	1	343
Congestive	"	956	"	"	1	302
Yellow	"	976	"	"	1	325
Intermittent	"	877	Eberle, Vol. 1			118

From the above Table, it will be seen that this Macon College Book—the 'Reform Medical Practice' has been modeled, mainly, after Watson's Practice, and that 40 diseases have been copied, more or less extensively from Watson; 19 from Dunglison; 10 from Wood; and 3 from Stokes & Bell! These are the very ablest medical authors *extant*. They have been copied *ad libitum* to the extent of from a single paragraph to 20 pages consecutively, *verbatim*.

The most glaring part of this trick, however, is the copying of Prof. Wood's articles on the Fevers: The entire family of fevers, as treated in this Thomsonian book, viz: Intermittent fever, Remittent fever, Typhoid fever, Typhus fever, Congestive fever, Yellow fever, and Scarlet fever are discoursed upon in the *exact* language, *word for word*, of Dr. Wood's book. I mean to say that not a single paragraph or sentence can be found in this Reform Medical Practice, on the subject of these fevers, that has not been *copied verbatim*, from the pages of Wood—excepting *only* the treatment. Every word in relation to the history, course, symptoms, pathology, causes, nature, diagnosis, prognosis, varieties, &c., comes from Wood's book, excepting one page which comes from Eberle's Practice, and also, *five lines* at the beginning of congestive fever, which *five lines* I suppose must be *original*, as I cannot find them in any author; and what is still more amusing, Wood's very language and his remedies are frequently adopted in the treatment of these fevers.

From page 863 to page 978; and from page 1005 to page 1024, we have 134 pages consecutively copied from Wood—taking out 31 pages devoted to the treatment. So we find 103 pages copied, straight along, from Wood, besides the 60 other diseases in which the copying process has been indulged *ad libitum* from the pages of other authors already mentioned.

All this borrowing has been indulged without acknowledgement. Even the common courtesy of placing quotation marks has been neglected. Not one is to be found! Indeed we observe

many efforts to conceal the *plagiarism* by disguise. The captions are changed, or left off; the matter copied under different headings; paragraphs cut up into two or three, &c., &c.  But when Samuel Thomson or any other Thomsonian author is quoted from, their names are given in the body of the book, and their language defined by quotation marks! 

"HOW LITTLE APPLES DO SWIM, I DECLARE"!!!

Now Reader! such is the Reform Medical Practice,—purporting to have been written by the Faculty of the Botanic College of Macon; Entered according to act of Congress, by M. S. Thomson, M. D., for the College; published by M. S. Thomson, M. D., for the Faculty! This is the "large volume of over a thousand pages," of which "Prof" Thomson boasts! The book that embodies "elaborately" the "principles" of Thomsonian Medicine!! Such is the book that is placed in the hands of Reform Medical students, as a text book! all "environed with Allopathic error" copiously adulterated with Allopathic composition, *poisonously* imbued with Allopathic sentiment! "Young students" of Thomsonism! beware how you read that book, for when you have mastered its contents, you may have gained but the "*loss of principle*," and the "*shade of the immortal Thomson*" may not recognize you as *true disciples*? You may find yourselves, in point of reading, just where Prof. J. T. Coxe assigned Dr. Newton of Worcester College, "in a fix of *betweenity*, 'twixt sublimated Thomsonism and very *pure* and *refined* Eclecticism, including a *vast deal* of Allopathia!"

But the authors (?) of this book may plead that they advertised in the Preface of their book that they had "drawn" on Dunglison, Bell & Stokes, &c." But such a plea would be puerile and unsatisfying to a scrupulous public. To draw on an author for "information," does not signify—in American Ethics—the copying that author *verbatim* to the amount of *an hundred and thirteen pages*, without acknowledgment, or the placing of a single mark by which the true author ever could be recognized; and this faculty did *not* so intend to confess, for in the close of the Preface they claim *authorship*, in "letter and spirit," by emphatically declaring that they "*wrote it*." (See Preface.)

Now if the reader is at all sceptical in regard to the correctness of any of these statements, I will take pleasure in demonstrating to him all the facts here mentioned. If he does not incline to look up the references that I have given him in the table above

—showing that the ‘Reform Medical Practice’ has been copied from Allopathic books—I will turn him to every book and page cited, and read him from paragraphs to many entire pages consecutively—even to an *hundred and thirteen pages* from the same Allopathic book! *These are facts*, and as demonstrably *true*, as that the sun shines, and I challenge contradiction!

But this is not the only book that acknowledges paternity to this Reform Medical College of Macon. There is another, called Worthy’s Botanic Practice, by A. N. Worthy, “Prof. of Theory and Practice in the Botanic Medical College at Forsyth Ga.”—This book is now before me, and is but a Botanic edition of Eberle’s Practice—written before this college had existence! On looking into it, I find, after the preliminary chapter, the first *hundred pages* copied from Eberle, which satisfies me that the entire book has thus been transcribed, excepting the treatment, in which *Lobelia* is written in the place of *Calomel*, and the steam-bath for the lancet.

These two books are the only works that have ever issued from the learned Faculty of the Reform College at Macon, which is head quarters, and now the “only Pepper school in the world.” This big book was published under the copy right act, and 2,000 copies printed and sold at \$6.00 per copy; but as to whether it was a legitimate speculation, and whether the guaranteed rights of other authors were not grossly infringed upon—the public must decide! And as regards the character and soundness of this book as a text book for the Thomsonian student, I think it would puzzle a Philadelphia lawyer to say whether it is a Thomsonian or an Allopathic book? Examine it ye true followers of Samuel Thomson and say whether you feel proud of your new book,—the ‘Reform Medical Practice,’ and whether you approve of the method by which it has been obtained.

It will thus be seen that the less some people say about their “large volumes of over a thousand pages,” the more credit may they enjoy for prudence?

“HOW LITTLE APPLES DO SWIM, I DECLARE”!!!

Such, reader, are some of the facts that I have ferreted out in relation to that pigmy—lilliputian system of Medicine, falsely called “Reform Medicine,” and which I should not have thus publicly noticed, had they not been challenged by that “redoubtable”

champion "Professor" M. S. Thomson in his recent 80 page pamphlet. These are all the facts that I had proposed to notice, as drawn from this recent pamphlet, and I challenge thorough investigation as to their truth. Look to the cited authorities, compare notes and be convinced for yourselves.

Now reader! to sum up, what have we found during this inquiry?—That Lobeliaism is evidently tottering. That out of five colleges, *one* remains. That the Faculty of the Macon College teach Thomsonism from Allopathic books. That they manufacture their books out of Allopathic authors. That their only college, the one at Macon—commodious and handsome as is their college edifice—has a class of only 50 or 60 students, as I learned the other day from one of its Professors. We have seen that they are forever abusing other people; that they professedly "cry aloud and spare not," and yet avail themselves, *ad libitum*, of the means and facilities, furnished by the untiring zeal of those whom they *delight* to abuse. They thrust envenomed darts at the Allopaths, and yet, illegitimately appropriate their hard earned researches to their own selfish weal. They scorn the teachings of standard Medical Science, and yet adopt these authors as *text books*! They denounce these books, as giving expression to doctrines *hateful and destructive to human life*, and yet greedily transcribe these pages—by the hundred—and incorporate them into their Thomsonian books! They rear their puny superstructure upon our time-honored basis, and yet, the mother profession receives only *invectives*, and *pop-gun* attacks, for all her benefactions.

O! consistency! art not thou a priceless jewel? and honesty—is it not, proverbially, the better policy? The most charitable view that we can take of our Pepper friends is, that policy dictates the resort to such expedients, and stern necessity compels the course pursued. Theirs is a weak-back hobby. The Lobelia Practice, possessing no inherent—intrinsic worth—has not been encouraged by popular approval. Its votaries see and confess that the Practice is waning into insignificance, amid the blazing sun-light of noon-day Science! One by one have their Colleges fallen! Here and there have their ablest champions deserted, and taken refuge under other colors. To them the sky is beclouded! the prospect ominous. A mighty rally must be made in its behalf! Hence the seizure of trivial pretexts for clamoring and boasting, for puffing and gasconading; and hence—most probably

—the unkind *personal* attacks, and the puerile and disrespectful tone adopted.

But, to what reef are they driving? Does not the history of the past presage the fate of the future? To what prospect, then, cling their hopes? If the noisome clamorings of some learned, and well-inflated "*Professor*" cannot save Thomsonism, then, it is to be feared that it will speedily be swept away, "as with the besom of destruction," and that the close of Fifty years to come will find not a vestige of its greatness.